

## REMARKS

### *Abstract Status*

An amended abstract is provided on a separate sheet in compliance with 37 CFR 5 1.52(b)(4). It is also noted that the documents submitted with the 371 application included an abstract on a separate sheet in compliance with 37 CFR 1.52(b)(4).

### *Claim Status*

Claims 1-2 are currently amended. Claim 3 is new.

10

Support for amended claims 1-2 can be found throughout the application as originally filed. More particularly, support for amended claims 1-2 can be found at least on FIGs. 4-5, and page 4, line 26 to page 5, line 46 of the application as originally filed. Support for new claim 3 can be found at least on Fig. 3 and Fig. 6 of the application as originally filed.

15 No new matter is introduced.

### *Regarding 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections*

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nakajima 20 (JP-02013590) in view of Shishido et al (JP-405230928).

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant traverses this rejection on the grounds that not all elements are taught by the combination of references. It is noted that currently amended claim 1 requires two elongated rail guides having a slot and a guide recess on the 25 upper end and a latching jaw with upper protrusions on the lower end. Claim 1 also

requires that the assistant ceiling plate is moveable on the rail guides. Elements 11 in Fig. 6 of Nakajima is cited by the Examiner as being rail guides, however, Applicant submits that element 11 is simply a support for an illumination plate 12 and is not a rail guide wherein an assistant ceiling plate is moveable along.

5

As stated by the Examiner, Nakajima is silent with respect to guide rails formed with a slot at an upper end. It is also noted that the cited text of Nakajima is silent with respect to a guide recess. In addition, claim 1 requires an assistant ceiling plate with downward protrusions for shielding the escape hatch. Examiner states that the replacement of the

10 illumination plate, of clear or translucent construction, of Nakajima by a metallic plate would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art. However, a clear plate would not visually shield the escape hatch, therefore Applicant submits that the illumination plate of Nakajima teaches away from the visually shielding plate of claim 1.

15 Additionally, Nakajima fails to teach an assistant ceiling plate having downward protrusions for engaging the upper protrusions of the latching jaws of the rail guides.

Furthermore, claim 1 requires that the assistant ceiling plate not cover the illuminating means of the elevator cab. In contrast, the illumination plate of Nakajima covers illuminating means 10.

20 Applicant submits that the cited references of Nakajima and Shishido fail to teach an assistant ceiling plate that can be separated from the rail guides and is moveable along the rail guides. The cited text of Shishido is directed to fitting structure of ceiling device and not elevators. In addition, the structures of Shishido appear to be fixed structures as shown in Figs. 5-6 and not a separable and moveable ceiling plate. The fixed structure of

Shishido would not be appropriate for the escape hatch shielding ceiling plate of claim 1 as the escape hatch must inherently be quickly accessible in an emergency.

For at least these reasons, Applicant holds claim 1 allowable over the cited references of

5 Nakajima and Shishido as the cited references do not include all elements of claim 1.

Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1, so the above arguments in connection with claim 1 are also responsive to the rejections of claims 2-3. Accordingly, Applicant holds that claims 2-3 are allowable over the cited references.

10 In addition to the above arguments in connection with claim 1, Applicant submits that dependent claim 3 is allowable over the cited reference. In particular, the cited texts of Nakajima and Shishido do not teach the further feature of an assistant ceiling plate positioned above the illuminating means. For at least these reasons, Applicant holds claim 3 allowable over the cited references.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Applicant hereby submits a bona fide attempt to address the rejections in the Office Action and argues why the present claims are different from the art of record. The Examiner is sincerely invited to telephone the undersigned at 650-424-0100 for clarification or any suggested actions such as an Examiner's Amendment to accelerate prosecution and forward the present application to allowance. Allowance of the claims now in the application is kindly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Trieu T. Mai /

Trieu T. Mai  
Reg. No. 61,354  
Lumen Patent Firm, Inc.  
2345 Yale Street, Second Floor  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
650-424-0100 (phone)

10